FELLOWSHIP

August 1945 Vol. XI—No. 8

dup c

The San Francisco Charter

By A. J. MUSTE

The White Christian and His Conscience

By LILLIAN SMITH

What Professors Think About Pacifism

By CLARENCE KIMES, JR.

The Function of a Religious Pacifist Organization

By ELIZABETH HASWELL

Is India to Be Free?

By HORACE G. ALEXANDER

The problem is not how to get rid of the enemy, but rather how to get rid of the last victor. For what is a victor but one who has learned that violence works? Who will teach *him* a lesson?

NICCOLO TUCCI, in *Politics*, July 1945.

15 cents a copy **$1.50 a Year**

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

THERE ARE FEW PACIFISTS who have not been faced, at one time or another, with the charge of inconsistency. Especially in time of war are we accused of being compromisers. "You are supporting this war in spite of yourselves" runs the indictment. "In certain picayune ways, you keep outside the conflict. But essentially you are in it. You are a member of a society at war, and you can no more escape the war than you can escape the common air."

I

The first thing to be said in answer to this charge is that it is true. I have never heard any pacifist deny that he was hopelessly entangled in the war situation. This is perhaps the chief agony of the pacifist in wartime—that, regarding war as the greatest of all evils, he is none the less a definite, however unwilling, participant in its operations. Try as he will, he cannot, in these days of total war, hold himself apart. Like a man cast into the sea, he must compromise with the waves as a condition of survival. Of course, there may be no good reason for survival, as Voltaire slyly suggested on a certain occasion. But there is never any good reason for suicide, which is the only way open to complete avoidance of warfare in these times. In any case, the pacifist is no escapist. He will not run away from war any more than he will run away from life. If by living he must participate in war, so be it.

The second thing to be said is that there is nothing new or strange in the pacifist's dilemma. His plight in relation to war is the plight of all social reformers in relation to the evils they fight. Take for example, the Southern opponents of Negro slavery before the Civil War—for there *were* such opponents in the Southern states! These men sought to abolish the evil, and themselves to have nothing to do with its operations. They would not own slaves, or buy and sell them. They would not take profit from slave industries. But they none the less shared responsibility for this system which was the very life of the South, and in the food they ate, the clothing they wore, the money they handled, participated daily in its continuance.

The Northern abolitionists were equally entangled in the evil they fought. They were citizens of a country whose Constitution recognized slavery, whose laws protected it, whose income prospered it. The wealth of the Northern states was in large part wrung from the sweat of the black cotton-picker as well as from the sweat of the white spindle-operator. So sensitive were the Northern abolitionists to their part in the slave system, that most of them declined to vote, and many of them were frankly in favor of repudiating the Constitution and dissolving the Union.

II

What is true of the pacifist today and of the abolitionist yesterday is true of all reformers and idealists. There is no escaping social sin. To the extent that we are members of society we are also sinners with society. For society, as Paul pointed out, is an organism of which we are all members who suffer, prosper, and sin together. Never was this so true as in these last few generations when our world has taken on a complexity that knits us like so many threads into an intricate but single pattern of existence. So long as this nation was founded upon a slave economy we were all slaveholders. So long as our Western world plunges into war at periodic intervals, and in the interims prepares for war, we all share in the guilt, as well as in the loss and horror, of armed conflict. Yes, it is true—the pacifist, as well as the non-pacifist, is in this war.

But what does this mean, if not that the pacifist has now an added incentive for getting rid of war? His intransigence on this subject is dictated primarily by his pity and love for men—his duty, as he sees it, to rescue the race from the most monstrous and fatal evil that has ever preyed upon its life. But he now has a duty also to himself—to win release from the awful guilt of lust, hate, and murder which war imposes upon him! If ever he is to stand justified before God and in his own sight, it must be through the extinction of this most dreadful evil of man's existence. Prove, as you easily can prove, that the pacifist is a participant with men generally in war, and you have also proved the righteousness and the necessity of his all-out war against war. His guilt is the justification of his cause.

III

But the pacifist in wartime need not feel undue embarrassment. If he would keep his heart clean, as well as his head clear, he has but to do two things:

First, hold himself apart from war activities wherever he is free to do so. The relations of any citizen to war are of two kinds—voluntary and involuntary. In a hundred and one different matters relating to this war, I have no choice as to what I shall do. If I am to function at all I must participate in the war effort. I cannot use the telephone, send a telegram, drive an automobile, or buy a tube of tooth paste, without supporting the war. But there are a score of other activities of momentous character which are voluntary and in which I can act, or not act, as I may choose. In such matters—wearing the uniform, buying war bonds, or working in munitions industries—I can be faithful to my conscience. I can, by an act of free will, be true to myself. And as I can, so also I will, in such cases, have nothing to do with war.

Secondly, the pacifist must continue increasingly to fight war, and seek to destroy it utterly. Here, in the conviction he cherishes, in the testimony he bears, in the fight he wages, he can be one hundred per cent opposed to war and outside its operations. Like Garrison, the abolitionist, he can cry, "I will not equivocate, I will not excuse, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard." A pacifist who lives up to this pledge need not worry. There is but one enemy today, and that is war. If he fights that enemy day and night, with all his mind and heart and soul and strength, then is he "not unfaithful to the heavenly vision."

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway
New York, 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

August 1945 — Vol. XI—No. 8

With its ratification by the U. S. Senate, what should be our attitude toward —

The San Francisco Charter

By A. J. MUSTE

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE closed with the signing by representatives of all the nations present of the *Charter of the United Nations.* The United States Senate has since ratified the document, and its ratification by practically all of the other leading nations now seems assured. These are the facts with which we are confronted. It is necessary that we try to appraise their significance and to determine how the cause of peace and world order may be most effectively promoted in the light of these developments.

The fact that the San Francisco Conference did not break up and that it laid the foundations of the United Nations Organization signifies first of all that the coalition of the Big Three which won the war against Germany is probably going to continue for a considerable period. In other words, these powers are determined that on the conclusion of the war against Japan there shall be a cessation of large-scale and overt war-operations. There will therefore probably be an armistice, a breathing-space.

Pacifists rejoice that a temporary end to open and incredibly destructive warfare is thus in prospect. War solves no problems, but complicates and aggravates them. Men and nations can work more effectively for a just and brotherly world order when they are not engaged in mutual slaughter.

The mere fact that lengthy and often heated discussions took place and that very vigorous efforts were made by the representatives of the smaller nations to change many items in the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and in the Yalta voting arrangements was a healthy sign. These delegates felt and reflected the passionate desire of war-weary peoples for enduring peace and genuine world organization, and the deep-seated suspicion of multitudes in all lands that their hopes for the achievement of these ends could not safely be entrusted to the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and the Yalta agreement.

A crucial question then is whether the Charter framed at San Francisco is *at essential points* an improvement on these documents.

It is true that there has been some improvement. The Preamble and the expanded first chapter affirm faith in "fundamental human rights, in the dignity and value of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." The declared purposes of the Organization now include development of respect for "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" and "promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex." The Economic and Social Council which is to be established is called upon to establish a commission "for the promotion of human rights." But there have, unfortunately, been many instances where similar words in such documents have proved to mean little or nothing.

The possibility for *discussion* of important issues in the Assembly has been widened. The veto power of the Big Five in the Security Council was after very lengthy and often acrimonious debate curtailed in that none of the Big Five can veto consideration of a dispute to which it is a party, nor can it veto an attempt at peaceable settlement of such a dispute. Even here there may be a "joker," for as the *Information Service* of the Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council points out, "it does not appear how the question whether or not a nation is party to a dispute will be determined. If the language is to be literally interpreted, a great power may vote on an issue involving its special interests because not *formally* a party."

In spite of these and other changes which might be mentioned, we believe that *in its essentials* the San Francisco Charter is not an improvement on but conforms to the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta pattern.

The Security Council dominates the organization and the Big Five dominate the Council. Each retains veto power even over efforts at peaceful settlement where it is not formally party to the dispute, and veto power over sanctions if it is a party. They retain veto power over amendments and over the admission of new members.

The organization will admittedly have no power to curb aggression by the Big Three. The little nations remain "the sole targets" of the force it may invoke.

The Organization is expressly deprived of any power to do anything about any actions taken or to be taken against any enemy nation in World War II.

The all-important matter of reduction of armaments and disarmament is placed in the hands of the *Military Staff Committee,* to be composed of the military chiefs of the Big Five, though the General Assembly may make recommendations to the governments or Security Council concerning *"principles* governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments."

The Trusteeship Council, of which much has been made, has no authority for supervision, inspection, or even admonition outside those areas which may be voluntarily placed under its care. The problems of colonial and dependent peoples, of British, Dutch, and French imperialism, and of occupation of strategic bases by the United States are thus left in a thoroughly unsatisfactory position.

There are those who argue that since the Big Three have the military, economic, and political power, to recognize that fact and to leave that power subject to no real control is a sign of forthrightness and "healthy realism" which somehow guarantees that the new organization will be effective and secure the peace of the world. This argument, we contend, is highly specious and dangerous. If it were a valid one, then the long and passionate effort of the small and middle nations under the leadership of H. V. Evatt of Australia to achieve fundamental alterations in the Yalta voting arrangements must be put down as a deplorable mistake. We do not so regard it.

On the contrary, the demand of the Big Nations that they be given veto power and thus left free from the controls which they insist other nations must accept is another indication of the tendency in the modern world toward the centralization of power and dependence on military might —another step in the direction of totalitarianism.

Alliance of Victor Nations

Even the most enthusiastic supporters of the new organization say that its fate rests on the continuance of the alliance among the Big Powers. But there is no more precarious basis for peace than an alliance of victor nations, imposing a "peace" on their defeated enemies and on the rest of the world, and seeking to build a rigid structure which will perpetuate the settlement they impose. It is obvious that even now the victor nations are far from having reached agreement on vital issues and that a terrific though concealed struggle for strategic resources and military vantage points is going on among them.

Under these circumstances it remains the case that the United Nations Organization is likely to prove at once an instrument of and a camouflage for the continuation of imperialist policies and the exercise of arbitrary power by the Big Three for the domination of the world. This is the road not to peace but to World War III.

With the ratification of the San Francisco Charter by the United States Senate, it must be accepted as one of the factors in the world situation with which we have to deal.

This does not mean that we can give support to those features of the Charter which we have criticized. To the contrary, we believe that the most important responsibility of religious leadership today is not to join in statements and actions which will lull the peoples into a false sense of security, will lead them to think there is "peace, peace, when there is no peace" but at best a most precarious armistice. It is only if the peoples are helped to face realities and realize how insecure is the ground on which they now stand, how much remains to be done, that there is hope that they will be roused to action.

On the other hand, we recognize that pacifists would be ill-advised if ostrich-like they tried to act as if the United Nations Organization did not exist, or if they refuse to make use of those aspects of it which might be utilized in working for enduring peace and genuine world organization.

What To Do Now

It is necessary now to rally all forces to work for such ends as the following:

1. Abandonment by the United States of imperialist policies such as military occupation and unilateral control of strategic bases in the Pacific. This would enable the United States effectively to summon other nations to abandon unilateral action and imperialist policies.

2. Abandonment of plans for the partition of Germany, the destruction of its economic life, the restoration of German industrialists to power, and all other vindictive and negative policies. Encouragement, instead, of the democratic elements in Germany and positive measures for relief of suffering in Germany and other European lands, the restoration of economic life and the admission to the United Nations at the earliest possible time of a government elected by the German people and willing to accept membership in the United Nations Organization and the obligations this entails.

3. Continuation of efforts to bring the war in the Pacific to a close at the earliest possible time, with provision for a just and generous peace for the Japanese people.

4. The offer by our government to join immediately with Russia and all other nations in implementing such plans for universal disarmament and abolition of military conscription by international agreement as Litvinov proposed at the League of Nations on behalf of the Soviet Government in 1927.

5. Full utilization of the Economic and Social Council provided for in the San Francisco Charter and of other functional agencies in the work of relief and rehabilitation throughout the world and for raising the standard of living of the masses everywhere.

6. The transformation of the United Nations Organization as rapidly as possible into a genuine world government under law, not based on force and not dominated by any small group of nations.

If the Great Powers do not abandon power politics and the right to act unilaterally or in military alliance for their own interests as against other nations, the United Naions Organization cannot but prove, as we have pointed out, at once an instrument of and a camouflage for the attempt of a military alliance to impose a victors' peace and to organize the world to suit itself. On such sand no house of peace can be built.

If such steps as we have outlined are taken, the evil done at San Francisco may be undone, what was left incomplete may be amended, and the good done may be used to the utmost and greatly extended. Let us not put our trust in illusions, neither let us despair. The work of building enduring peace and genuine world organization must and can go on.

The White Christian and His Conscience*

By LILLIAN SMITH

EVER SINCE THE FIRST WHITE CHRISTIAN enslaved the first black man, the conscience of America has been hurting.

Had we as a people not been Christian, had we not believed in the teaching of love and brotherhood, it would have been easier. For a man who does not believe in the equality of human need, who does not claim a stake in the democratic ideal, has no problem with his conscience when he takes a stand for white supremacy. He can exploit others, feel superior to them, persecute them, discriminate against them, and go to bed at night knowing he will sleep.

Most of us have an idea that the Germans slept well during those years when they segregated the Jew, persecuted him, starved him, in the name of Nordic superiority. For Hitler was shrewd enough to know that a conscience is a heavy thing to take with you on a journey back to savagery. Hence he tried to destroy utterly the concepts of Christian love and brotherhood, he tried to wipe out notions about the equality of human need, he tried to burn all books that gave insight into human relations; he did everything possible to keep the conscience of the German people clear, so that they would be free to give their minds and hearts completely to the job of destroying the rights of others to live like human beings. I think sometimes that perhaps we hate the Nazis even more bitterly than we otherwise would because we believe that their conscience has hurt so little while ours has ached and pained us for 300 years! And nowhere has it hurt us more than in the Deep South, where we have lynched, burned, and segregated human beings simply because their skin was darker than ours. And nowhere is hatred of the German Nazi worse than in the Deep South.

Now today, as we look at these Germans, stripped of love, naked in their hate, we see them as worse than savages—far worse—for a man who has once had a conscience and gives it up, befouls his spirit and becomes an unclean thing.

And we? Let us look at ourselves in humility and honesty: The white man in America was willing neither to give up Jesus nor to give up the slave. He was willing to give up neither democracy nor white supremacy. He was willing to give up neither his conscience nor his way of life. Today he is still unwilling—with the result that in many areas of his life he has given up his sanity instead. We cannot understand America and race without understanding the role that conscience has played in our national drama and our personal lives—and is still playing today.

What a profound conflict it has created! A conflict that tears the heart and mind of Americans, doing strange things to our culture, our personalities, our children, and seeping through every level of our life like a slow-spreading poison.

Our conscience has never let us rest. But we have learned, as the years passed, to talk back to it. We were compelled to think up a lot of things to say and we have said them:

We began by giving a name to this trouble, for folks feel better when they can find a name for what is troubling them. We called it "the Negro problem"—projecting upon the Negro the millstone that our conscience had hung around our own soul. Yes, and today we actually are still calling it the Negro problem, though we don't know why and never have known *why* the Negro is a "problem." We simply tell ourselves he is, for we cannot bear to take that millstone back and put it on our own hearts *where it belongs.* For decades we have talked and talked and still no one has ever discovered what the problem is and no one has ever "solved" it. Even science cannot discover one thing about the Negro as a Negro that makes him a problem. No inferiority of mind or body as compared to the white man; no difference in the way his emotions function; no difference in ability to adapt successfully to any culture, however complex it may be. All that science has been able to discover about the Negro is that he can fight as well as the white man; he can learn as easily; he can build as quickly and tear down as ruthlessly; he can invent and dream; create, and destroy what he has created, as can men with white skins; he can love and hate, sing and laugh, weep and rage and suffer; he can be stupid and terribly wise; strong and compassionate, and weak and resentful. He, like you and me, is a human being in search of a world where he can feel at home. That is all science can tell us about the Negro.

But we are not satisfied by science. So our governors and our mayors and our churches appoint committees to study the "Negro problem." (Sometimes for a change we call it the race problem.) But no mayor, no governor, no church, no President of the United States has ever appointed a committee to study the white man and his deep need to feel superior to other human beings and to have power over their lives.

It is a curious thing to me that when we talk about Germany and the Jews, about Nazis and Hitler's racial theories, we don't speak of the "Jewish problem." We talk about the problem of the Nazis and their racial beliefs and acts of exploitation. We talk about anti-Semitism. We focus on the crux of the conflict and keep our eyes fixed there. But in America we do as people who are tormented by their conflicts always try to do: we attempt to push the conflict outside ourselves, on to another. We study the Negro in order to keep from having to study the white man. We try in every way possible to shut ourselves away from the problem of the white man and his feelings about himself. In order to segregate the Negro from as much of our life as possible we were compelled to segregate our life from everything that would remind us of our conflict. We tried to shut ourselves away from books, and from science wherever it touched on human relationships. We especially feared psychiatry and psychoanalysis, for we knew in our hearts that the psychiatrists could tell us things about ourselves that we could not bear to hear. Jim Crow has been used for many purposes: to

* A speech given by the author at Ford Hall Forum in Boston, at the Institute of Race Relations in Louisville, Ky., and to several other groups, Spring 1945.

win an election, to break the strength of a union, to keep jobs for the white man. But its main use today is to keep the white man from seeing what he is doing to other human beings.

It is difficult to explain on rational levels the panic which so many white people feel when the removal of segregation barriers is talked about. Only by probing deeply *into our emotional need for these barriers* can we realize their strength, and the effect they have had on all of our culture. Perhaps it will give us more insight if we remind ourselves *how* we learned about segregation. We learned about segregation when we were almost too little to know words. We who are white learned this lesson from the people we love most—our families. We learned about race at the same time we learned about God and sex. We knew from our mother's tone that we were learning important things. We hardly understood reasons, but we knew there was a way to think about God, a way to think about our bodies—and a way to think about Negroes. Segregation became for us a kind of taboo, around which clustered fears and dread, just as certain aspects of sex became taboo. We feared to break these taboos. We fear them today. Good people, Christian people—especially in the South where we are trained so young—react in terror, almost in irrational panic, when the breaking of segregation taboos is discussed. Some good Christians, while believing in brotherhood, look upon segregation as they look upon the incest barrier. They actually would feel guilty if they broke down segregation. They would almost feel that they had sinned. I have known white Christians who felt physical illness the first time they ate with a Negro. Consciously they were at ease. They wanted to break the taboo. But at unconscious levels all was not well with them. Guilt feelings were stirred and these guilt feelings seeped up to the surface as sensations of physical illness.

This early training, mingled as it is with sex and God, with "right" and "wrong," has left otherwise good Christians profoundly confused, profoundly in conflict. If they believe in the teachings of Jesus they must give up the early teachings of their beloved families. For some people this is hard to do. It is like tearing part of your life out. We must have sympathy and patience for all such troubled souls, yet we must remember that new insight, warm desire, can change any human being, that perhaps this is today's moral equivalent of the old-time conversion our families believed in.

To ease the conflict with our conscience, to fit segregation into the Christian pattern, we made up stories about the greatness of the white man and the smallness of the Negro—stories about a white skin that gives a miraculous superiority, and a black skin that gives only shame and humiliation. And after a time we ourselves learned to believe the stories we told. We increased our stature by standing on the Negro and actually believed we were taller as he lay there beneath our feet. Time passed. These stories created images in our minds—images that after a time hardened into stereotypes, images that became masks which hid from our eyes the human beings behind them. And sometimes these stereotypes became strait jackets for our minds, shutting them away from freedom of thought. Perhaps nothing demonstrates this so well today as the questions asked by an audience—any audience—about race. Always the same questions. There are twenty-four of them, twenty-four stereotypes that close up the American mind, blocking it from fresh fields of inquiry.

Why the white man chose the "skin test" for superiority, no one quite knows. There are all kinds of facile explanations, but the more profound reasons for the white man's falling in love with his own image we have scarcely guessed at. Some people are satisfied with the obvious explanation that the red skin of the Indian and the black skin of the Negro gave us a color conditioning, as these skins happened to belong to two groups of human beings whose exploitation was advantageous to us. This historical accident undoubtedly played its role, but one can hardly be content with such an explanation. Others are satisfied with the suggestion that poverty and unemployment are at the root of racial prejudice and tension.

The more profound reasons we barely perceive. We know the white man—certainly the white Nordic—has a deep-rooted need to feel superior to others. We know he has an emotional insecurity, a fear of personal relationships, that have contributed to an urgent sense of sin. We know that our family life has often bred hate-love feelings that make for insecurity, for ambivalence in parent-child relationships. Some of us believe this deep-seated conflict may have driven the white Nordic into a regressive worship of his own image, into a group narcism, a "self-love," an infantile desire to be first; and that all these factors together—economic insecurity, historical accidents, a sense of sin springing from certain Puritan concepts, and a feeling that he has betrayed the Christianity he professes—have combined to plunge him into a way of life that is like quicksand. This is a field that needs further study by psychiatrists and anthropologists, for there are things about the white man that we need to know.

What we do know, however, is this:

In our attempts to segregate ourselves from our own conscience we have not only segregated other human beings from us but have also segregated ourselves from the heart of religion. We have cut ourselves away from love and brotherhood, from knowledge and understanding, from a common humanity. We have made a false image of our skin color and are today worshiping it. There are church members today who worship their skin color more devotedly than they worship Jesus. We, in Christian humility and truth, cannot deny this. We know that they have betrayed the teachings of Christ by giving their color priority over the needs of human beings.

There are other things we know today, also, about segregation. Not only is it true that we Jim-Crow Jesus Christ each time we Jim-Crow any human being (for the spirit of Jesus is in every living soul), but we Jim-Crow our own children, segregating them from those human experiences that make a personality creative, rich, and good—that make it grow. Sometimes we need to remember that not only the body needs vitamins, but the personality must have vitamins also. Self-esteem, belief in one's importance as a person, dignity, emotional security no child can do without. These vitamins can be given no child, white or colored, Christian or Jew, in a segregated culture. It isn't only the Negro child, the Jewish child, the Mexican child who suffers; the white Christian child is injured also. For we know well today that to hate tears up the heart and mind as much as to be hated; to be blind to human dignity, to be callous to human need, warps a personality as much as shame and suffering. We know that to feel superior is

as harmful to a child's growth as to feel inferior; to segregate is as injurious as to be segregated. A child's personality grows by reaching out to other human beings, by feeling identified with them, by acknowledging the common dignity of all human beings.

As we look across the earth today we are shocked by the deep chasms between people. Some of these have been dug by war itself; some by long years of poverty and unemployment; others by ignorance, by disease, by distance. But the deepest chasms on earth have been dug by the white man. He has dug them with the sharp tool of his belief that his skin color gives him priority over other human beings, and their right to feel at home on this earth where they were born. They are chasms deep and wide now into which all love of mankind, the dignity, the worth of the human being, is draining away, leaving hate and fear and arrogance and terrible cruelty behind, making of the earth no place for children to grow, no place for tenderness to flourish, for faith and sharing and esteem.

These chasms must be filled up. It is true that bridges can be built across them also—and quickly. Bridges such as group efforts to create jobs, to get rid of poverty, to give civil rights to citizens. But nothing can fill up the chasm except—to fill it. And this is primarily the white man's job. And primarily the white Christian's job. It is his job to dump into that chasm his need to hate, his need to feel superior, his need to worship his own image.

There are things to do. But nothing is more important than for white Christians to face themselves, to look into the mirror of Christ's teachings, and see their image reflected there. We must learn that we are human beings—not white semi-gods, not strange exalted creatures above the rest of mankind, but just a part of God's human family. We must face the great harm that we have done our own children by believing in white supremacy, by teaching these children arrogance and blindness and hardness of heart. We must learn the lesson that all the earth needs to know: that Christianity, democracy and sanity, all three, center in love and brotherhood, in a sharing of a common humanity, in making room on this earth for all to live on it in human dignity and with self-esteem; in making room in our own hearts for all the earth's peoples.

What Professors Think About Pacifism

By CLARENCE KIMES, JR.*

A WELL KNOWN PROFESSOR wrote me recently that "events have opened the eyes of all reasonable men to the unpardonable errors of pacifism." In a phrase he classified pacifism as "a harmful reproach to our world Christian faith." After conducting a survey on this issue among theological professors of leading seminaries in the United States, I learned that this rather extreme expression of anti-pacifism is not singular among "reasonable men" and yet, on the other hand, is far from typical. The largest group of those who took part in the survey judiciously view the pacifist position with understanding sympathy but refuse alliance on the grounds of intellectual or moral disagreement. A significant minority feel deeply not only that pacifism is a live, present-day issue but that its ideals can be a realistic part of a well examined way of life.

From coast to coast, with the South well represented, fifty professors replied to my request for information as to their personal position regarding pacifism. These men represent thirteen schools, nine states, twelve denominations, and eleven different teaching fields. Of the fifty responses, eight are definitely pacifist, thirty-five are clearly not pacifist, while seven are either in the valley of decision or are pacifists in one sense but not in another.

Convictions of the Pacifists

All eight of the pacifists designated their position as primarily a religious one. All agree further that their judgment or conviction is based in part on the ethic and spirit of Jesus. Most of them interpret the sayings of Jesus not in an absolute, legislative sense, but rather in an illustrative sense, leaving the individual free yet duty bound to determine the nature of God's will for himself in his own specific circumstances. Thus in most cases it would seem that the conviction that each individual holds in the interpretation of Jesus' ethic and spirit is a private one and not one to be demanded of all Christians.

Professor Roland Bainton is of the opinion that "some sayings apply only to private relations—at least are addressed only to individuals—such as 'turn the other cheek.' However, the statement, 'love your enemies' applies to both public and private relations. *Love,* however, is not a specific course of action, but a disposition, and how it is to be interpreted is a point on which Christians may differ."

Professor Cadbury and two others of the eight feel that in addition to the ethic and spirit of Jesus there was an intuitive religious or moral imperative which led them in the direction of pacifism—a sort of mystical demand, ineffable but very real.

Five of the group believe that war is at odds with the divine purpose being worked out in the universe. One of them, who arrived at pacifism largely because of dissillusionment as to the adequacy of war to achieve ideal ends, bases his position in part (besides those reasons given above) on the belief that war is dehumanizing and that any war generates the germs of future wars.

There is a surprising amount of absolutism in most of these men. Five express the determination to remain pacifists regardless of the consequences to themselves or their country. All but two advance the pragmatic argument that pacifism offers the least costly method of overcoming evil and that ultimately a stable society can best be promoted by holding to such a position. None of the eight would willingly serve as a non-combatant or a chaplain except in a modified sense. All had advocated disarmament in the interim between the wars.

The ages of these eight range from thirty-five to sixty.

* FOR member and student at Yale Divinity School.

No particular denomination seems to dominate. There are two Congregationalists, two Friends, two Methodists, one Baptist, and one Episcopalian. There seems to be no correlation between belief and teaching field, since there are five fields represented in the group. It is quite interesting to note, however, that all but two of these persons are located in New England, and also without exception they are recognized leaders in their respective fields.

Views of the Hybrids

Those who are pacifist in one sense but not in another I shall refer to as hybrids. It is difficult to interpret this hybrid position. The major element in common seems to be a personal or private pacifism at variance with a sense of social or public responsibility. A look at two of the men of this group may serve to illustrate in general the position of the entire seven, though no two positions are in detail alike.

On the surface of things, one of these men would seem to be without question a non-pacifist. He explains first that he was once a pacifist but has changed his position. He makes at least four statements to show that he is not a pacifist; then he qualifies all of this by saying, "The pacifist issue is a false issue as far as defining national policy is concerned. It remains a live personal issue in determining one's own participation in the war effort." "For example," he explains, "I find my own Christian duty today to be defined in terms of opposition to *this* war." By these words and his approval of a statement in my questionnaire—"I am a pacifist in this war, but prefer to judge each war on its own basis"—it would seem that he takes the Augustinian view that some wars are justifiable while others are not.

The second man in this group states that he is both a pacifist and not a pacifist. He explains, "My individual choices are pacifistic but I cannot escape responsibility to protect others and to co-operate with others in the interest of democracy in human relations." His pacifism is based on the spirit and ethic of Jesus, on the belief that war is at odds with the divine purposes being worked out in the universe, that war is dehumanizing, and that any war generates the germs of future wars. He confesses that he arrived at his "pacifism" largely because of disillusionment as to past wars achieving anything worth while. His non-pacifist beliefs center around the idea that as a responsible member of society he has no choice between war and peace.

It would seem according to this survey (which necessarily must be considered in the light of its incompleteness) that pacifism has little place among the professors of our theological schools, and it would even seem to be losing ground; for of the fifty that replied, nine had made a transition away from some sort of pacifist position. Professor C. C. McCown stated that between 1920 and 1925 he was inclined toward pacifism, but found pacifists utterly unrealistic, working with futile tools. At present he regards pacifism as a conscious or unconscious means of escape from disagreeable realities. John C. Bennett, also one of the nine, explained that he was once a pragmatic pacifist but that the world changed and his pragmatic pacifism lost meaning. A well known scholar in the field of theology described his change as a gradual one, incident to his abandonment of an originally Tolstoyan pessimism about all governments, and the growth of active concern with the problems of world government. He now believes that a genuine world government would abolish war or greatly reduce its magnitude and frequency, but that such a world government can only be set up in and through a war of resistance against the threat of tyranny.

Ideas of Non-pacifists

The reasons given by those who reject pacifism are many and diverse. The following tabulation summarizes the answers given to the alternative statements listed in my questionnaire, and indicates the number so answering:

(31) Evil as war is, nevertheless it is the temporary, awful alternative to something worse.

(7) "All justice which the world has ever known has been established through tension between various vitalities, forces, and interests in society. All such tension is covert conflict and must on occasion become overt."

(10) The individual as such has no choice between war and peace. As a member of society he has responsibility for the actions of that society in peace and war. The issue between pacifists and non-pacifists is a false issue.

(7) After war is declared, ethical choice concerning it is impossible and the sphere of pacifist action is practically non-existent. Therefore any distiction between pacifists and non-pacifists is basically false in a war setting.

(17) Any absolutist position concerning a social phenomenon as variable as war is likely to prove morally untenable in the light of changing social conditions and their moral demands.

Other reasons for rejection of the pacifist position were written in. One professor recognizes the inevitability of sin and imperfection in his own person and in mankind in general. He feels that as a participant in the destructive procedures of war he is falling short of the true expression of God's will through himself. He does not regard participation in war the duty of the Christian as a disciple of Jesus. Such participation he maintains "stems from his (the Christian's) relation to other things and persons than Christ or God." However, in the sense that the Christian as a disciple of Jesus is still a human being, participation in war is compatible with Christian duty.

One professor in the East feels that pacifism is not a possible procedure intellectually. He is of the opinion that consistent pacifism would have to be practiced within a nation as well as between nations, so that the police regulation of violent action should yield to "non-resistant goodwill." This he thinks is impossible.

A professor of church history believes that "war is the opportunity presented to the individual to take up his cross and offer his life for his brother as a ransom for many. Every soldier is committed to this and nothing less."

Attitudes Toward Pacifists

The attitudes of the non-pacifist group toward the advocates of pacifism reveal sympathy in spite of disagreement. An overwhelming majority feel that respect for conscience is so great a good, in war as in peace, that they as non-objectors are required to defend it. A similar majority believe it their duty to defend the conscientious objector's rights against invasion by state or people. A substantial majority advocate financial support for those

pacifists who do relief and reconstruction work in the midst of war.

Twenty-four of the thirty-five are in favor of continued exemption of all clergymen from armed service. Four of this number express a preference for civilian status for men of the chaplaincy. There are seventeen who would exempt persons who, in the midst of war, are involved in moral reconstruction and relief work, irrespective of their being pacifists or non-pacifists. In this regard ten believe that the relief and reconstruction work done by some pacifists has an especial value because it is given regardless of war alignments and from a position of emotional aloofness.

A professor of theology from the Midwest refers to what Elton Trueblood calls a belief in *vocational pacifism*. He explains that there are those who are called even in the midst of war, to be uncompromising servants of those constructive endeavors without which peace and reconciliation can never be achieved. He feels that if he were of military age he would be hard pressed to decide what branch of the service of mankind to enlist in—the military branch or the pacifist branch.

Another man takes a rather opposite view. He does not believe in exemption "or any other special favors" for the clergy. "The clergy should, of all people, not fail to participate deeply in the experiences, the trials of their contemporaries." He is consistent in carrying out what he believes since he volunteered for service and is now in the chaplaincy.

Interpretations of Jesus' Sayings

The problems posed by the sayings of Jesus on nonresistance brought a diversity of answers. As with the pacifist group, the largest number would leave the field open for wide interpretation by giving as their major answer that the sayings are to be taken in an illustrative sense, carrying ethical imperatives but leaving each person free to determine God's will for himself in his own specific circumstances. There are ten who hold that the sayings are signs of God's impinging kingdom. Jesus proclaimed the pure will of God by giving the general ideal of what God demands, but his sayings necessarily cannot describe the specific applications of God's demands in the immediate world flux, for human culture is constantly changing. Professor Grant, the well-known New Testament scholar, and six others think that the sayings disclosed a way of action possible in private but not in public or political relations. Many men became quite specific and expressed themselves at some length on this point. The only summary that can be made is that some feel they can base their pacifism on these sayings, while others feel equally justified in taking the sword in the light of the same utterances.

With the post-war conscription problem taking on larger significance, it is of special interest to note that fifteen of the non-pacifists oppose permanent military conscription while seven are in favor of it. Eleven qualify an affirmative answer by the question as to whether such a program is necessary in the light of the kind of peace that will be effected and the general world conditions at the end of the war.

In a word of summary it would seem safe to say that, so far as theological professors are concerned, pacifism is far from a dead issue. A small but not insignificant minority of pacifists continue zealously to uphold their position and among non-pacifists there seems to be a genuine sympathy with some of the sincere pacifist's idealistic standards and an appreciation of his desire to be of practical, constructive service.

The Function of a Religious Pacifist Organization

By ELIZABETH HASWELL*

IN ENDEAVORING TO THINK OUT the cause of the weakness of the pacifist movement, I have come to the following conclusions. The pacifist of the present day is apt to be a person who has taken this position after reaching maturity. And, having come to believe that all war is wrong, he joins a pacifist organization. He may have experienced bitter conflict because of his stand; perhaps disagreement with those near and dear to him. He feels spiritually lonely and he longs for association with those who think and feel as he does, those who will listen to him with interest when he expresses his own convictions about the cause and cure of war.

In a pacifist organization he does find those who are like him in holding strong convictions about the evil of war and about what has caused the evil and what will cure it. But these new friends are apt to differ greatly with him in the specific ideas they hold concerning those important matters. These people have had widely differing backgrounds, have lived different lives, and have had different emotional experiences in relationship to the social order. Those who have felt a deepening of their spiritual lives through any experience with economic systems speak of a reality when they praise that system. Those who have felt or seen suffering at close range in connection with an economic situation, speak also of a reality when they express feeling against that system. Therefore, when a group of people united in a common belief that war is wrong, try to work together, they may find themselves in sincere disagreement about the evils which they see in a causal relationship to war. Since their feeling is apt to be strong about such things, they consider it their duty to propagandize one another, and the resulting confusion may limit the effectiveness of the work which they can do together. Those, for instance, who feel that capitalism is a cause of war may have such strong emotions on this subject that they have difficulty in granting sincerity to those

* FOR member of Dayton, Ohio.

who disagree with them. Those who view racism as an important cause of war are apt to feel that work against segregation is one of our greatest opportunities to work for peace, and they may feel so strongly about it that they find it impossible to view with equanimity the fact that not all fellow-pacifists are equally emotional about this issue.

The simple truth is that pacifists are all too often united only on a negative basis. They agree in a general way that war is wrong and that they should not participate in it. They may also subscribe to such beliefs as the one in the Fellowship statement of purpose which says that love can be used as an effective force for the overcoming of evil and for transforming society. But the chances are that neither their past emotional experience nor their training have given them any clear or practical idea of the way to develop or successfully use this positive force. In fact, the very word love as sensed by them may have a wide range of meaning. The word generally has a rather weak and sentimental connotation when used in any but the personal field. And moreover, how can one who is tense with the consciousness of wrong in the world start forcing himself to love the evildoers?

So far in the history of the world the data to support the positive pacifist contention is very scattered and does not form a convincing picture. It is true that a significant number of individuals have organized their spiritual lives for the use of the healing force of love. Certain incidents in the lives of such people give impressive proof that love can overcome hatred and fear in personal relationships. But group life, even in local groups, has rarely been organized for the expression of love toward other groups. For that reason, great faith and imagination are required to envisage even the *possibility* of nations expressing love as a means of overcoming the organized evil in other nations. In time of war, national problems burden the minds of all, and therefore it is not surprising that individuals today, unable to approve of war, often do not find any satisfactory release from tensions through association with other pacifists who are troubled.

What hope is there for the growth of a pacifist movement adequate to the needs of the world? I feel that there is very little possibility in any near future. It seems to me that at our present stage of vision and accomplishment pacifists and pacifist organizations who have glimpsed a principle but have not yet been able to give effective demonstrations of its use. Like scientists, they must be humble enough to be experimental. Most pacifist organizations need not only room for differences of opinion but also for differences in the activities sponsored to express opinion. In matters of conflicting conviction no majority vote can dissolve differences. In matters of conscience pacifists should know better than anyone else the inadequacy of the majority vote. Pacifists are a minority themselves and have always shown respect for the rights of other minorities. Certainly they must respect and make room in their own organizations for minority opinion and its implementation.

When the FOR Council, or even a majority of the members of the Fellowship, decide upon the sponsorship of a controversial matter in the name of the whole organization, it might seem the peaceful thing for all members to accept the conclusions. But the fact that FOR members are often unwilling to do this is in reality a good sign. Any authentic belief is more valuable than a heedless acquiescence. Imperfect as an individual's insight may be, he is going to gain more light by following the light that he has than by refusing to trust his present convictions and preferring to go with the majority. Common agreement upon a broad statement of faith should be the basis of FOR membership, as of course it is. But I think that groups within the organization should be able to work upon projects which express their convictions without implicating others who do not agree with them about the value or desirability of these particular projects.

For instance, those who do not approve of the projects involving non-violent direct action should not have to contribute to the stimulation of such projects. But those who do have faith in this method should have the opportunity to use it and to support it. We have had the experience of a conflict in FOR over the membership in NSBRO. I feel it might have been avoided if the fact could have been recognized that it was not necessary or desirable to have the FOR representative represent the whole organization. I hope that the present arrangement may prove satisfactory and I am very glad that it has been made. We must always make it clear that we do make room in our organization for differences of opinion such as that involved in this case.

But if we are to make room for such differences in ideas and activities, and still have a strong pacifist organization, it seems evident to me that we must strengthen the consciousness of the underlying spiritual faith which we hold in common. I believe that FOR would do well to consider putting more emphasis on the development of our spiritual faith and of our emotional powers. If conferences could be held for students of the psychology of pacifism, as well as for study of the expression of the faith in action, I think that many would benefit. The best minds in the movement are as yet not good enough to solve the problems before us. I therefore believe that we should meet together sincerely for new light. I think that conferences for this purpose should be set up by the National FOR in places and for periods of time which invite reflective thought.

The world is waiting for a demonstration of a better way of doing things. We have dared to state our faith that there is one. If our idea is true, then the laws of life are on our side and our responsibility is to demonstrate these laws so effectively that they will become the basis of future civilizations. We have no right to consider ourselves a permanent minority. We must become such superior people that a natural leadership will be ours. The function of the pacifist organization is to aid its members in their spiritual development and faith and also in the effective use of their personal powers in active life. The consciousness of the underlying unity of faith and purpose should be strengthened so that divergence of opinion regarding the expression of this faith in action will not weaken the faith itself, but will be welcomed as experimentation in our common quest for truth and for ways of winning society to its acceptance.

Is India to Be Free?

By HORACE G. ALEXANDER*

AFTER NEARLY THREE YEARS OF CONFLICT between the British Government and the Congress—India's chief nationalist party, whose leaders have been held in detention without trial since August, 1942—Lord Wavell, the Viceroy, has broken the tension by releasing the Congress leaders and inviting them, along with some other leaders, to confer about an interim plan for the government of India. Is this a step toward Indian freedom?

It is my impression that many Americans are not aware how near India has already been to freedom. During the two years from 1937 to 1939 the eleven provinces of British India, some of them more populous than any American state, were under genuine self-government. Although a British governor remained in each province, the Ministry did not need to consult him on any matter of policy. Police, finance, education, industry, agriculture, food, health—all these and other departments of government were in the hands of ministers responsible to the electorate. The Governor's right of veto was still in the Constitution; but he did not exercise it, and it seemed likely that he would not exercise it in the future. Optimists began to hope that in the light of the successful working of provincial self-government the British Government would find the argument for transferring real power at the center irresistible. It seemed likely that by 1941 or 1942 India would be as independent of outside control as Canada or Switzerland or any other free state. The then Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, had become personally friendly with Mr. Gandhi. Apart from some intensification of communal friction, in South India especially, everything seemed to be going favorably.

Then came the war. The Viceroy declared India at war with Germany without consulting any Indian leader. India's pride was deeply hurt. The Congress inquired about British war aims. If the war was being fought for freedom and democracy, how were those principles to apply to India? Official replies were hesitating and obscure. Before the end of 1939 the Congress leaders had decided that this was just another British imperialist war, in which they could take no part. They withdrew their ministers from the provincial governments and in consequence, in half a dozen provinces it became necessary to revert to a system of government that lacked all elements of popular representation.

That situation has endured till now. Between 1939 and 1942 various attempts were made from both sides to break the deadlock, culminating in the Cripps Mission to India in the spring of 1942. All failed, and at last in August, 1942, the conflict came to a head, and the Government, regarding the Congress attitude as an intolerable embarrassment to the war effort, arrested all the main Congress leaders, and has refused since then to consider any plans for breaking the deadlock, though persistent attempts have been made by Indian liberals and others to find a basis for agreement.

It is common ground among all Indians today that nothing short of a genuine national government will satisfy them. Some agreement must be arrived at by which the 1935 Constitution, in suspense for more than four years, becomes operative again in the provinces, so that ministers begin to function there again. A reform of the central government is also needed; and it must be of such a character that the main Indian parties, especially the Congress and the Muslim League, are willing to take part in it. Both these great parties want to see India free. But the Congress believes in Indian unity, while the Muslim League, or at least its leader, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, believes that India is two nations—one Hindu, the other Muslim. He insists that he wants self-government just as much as the Congress. "I want to see two free Indias, not one slave India," he declares. Will the new proposals meet these demands?

One other issue must be further disentangled before an answer can be attempted to this question. It is sometimes said that Sir Stafford Cripps, on behalf of the British Government, offered India full independence in 1942. Why, it is asked, did India reject such an offer? What more could they want? It is true that the Cripps offer recognized Indian independence *in principle*. But it was subject to two important conditions. It was not an offer to be implemented in 1942; it was to come into effect after the end of the war with Japan. And even that was not all. It was to take effect only after the main Indian parties had agreed on a free Constitution. How wide must the agreement be before the British Government will accept it? Cripps seemed to suggest that agreement of the Congress and the Muslim League would be sufficient. Subsequent official statements seem to indicate, however, that other parties—the Princes, the representatives of the depressed classes, and perhaps the Sikhs—must accept too. And in India it is widely believed that the formula is so expressed that it will never become operative—that the British Government will always be able to say: "But such and such a minority has not agreed. We must retain power to protect the minorities." So much for the promise of independence.

The new White Paper in effect repeats the offer of independence. It assumes that Indians are to get together and agree on a Constitution as soon as possible after the war. Nothing new is said about that. No new method of finding agreement is proposed. The present proposal is for an interim arrangement, without altering the existing Constitution, by which the chief Indian parties, or their leaders, can become members of the central government. The only legislative change in the present Constitution would be the abolition of the provision that three members of the Central Executive must be officials. Apart from the Viceroy himself and the Commander-in-Chief, every member of the Executive will be a representative party leader, if the negotiations are successful. The Viceroy is, in the future, to "make his selection for nomination to the Crown for appointment to his Executive from among leaders of Indian political life at the center and in the provinces in proportions which would give a balanced representation of the main communities, including equal proportions of Muslims and caste Hindus."

This last clause has immediately brought a rebuke from Mr. Gandhi. India's whole political life is cursed by the conflicting claims made by various groups in the name of their respective religious communities. It cannot be denied that in many respects the social and other differences between Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, and others are real and important. Indian life is still largely colored by religious affiliation, in a sense that most Westerners cannot realize because to them religion has become a rather loose appendage. But to insist that religious affiliation must always color political life, that religious communities in their existing form must be mathematically recognized, is to rivet on India shackles from which every well-wisher must desire to see her freed. On the other hand, every sane man in India knows that, if India's political life is to be actively supported by all sections of the population, the attitudes and interests of minority communities must be borne in mind. It is likely that the Congress leaders, in submitting a list of Executive Councillors to the Viceroy, may have the wisdom to include a high proportion of Muslims, also perhaps a Sikh, a Christian, and an Untouchable—not just to "represent" these communities, but because able men and women, nationally minded, ready and fit to serve the whole nation, can be found in all these communities.

The new proposals, though hardly distinguishable in essence from the Cripps proposals, have received a fairly favorable response from Indian leaders. This must be partly because

(Continued on page 147)

* Lecturer on international relations at Woodbrooke College, England, and author of *India Since Cripps*.

Martin Bill Asks International Agreement to Abolish Conscription

On July 5 the House Committee on Post-War Military Policy, which conducted hearings in June, recommended to Congress the adoption of the "broad policy of universal military training"; and on July 16 Rep. Joseph W. Martin (Mass.), House Republican leader, introduced a resolution calling for the international abolition of conscription.

Pacifist organizations have requested that persons opposed to conscription be allowed to go abroad to make speeches to the armed forces of the United States, but they have been told by the War Department that this could not be arranged. Meanwhile, persons favoring conscription are going abroad and making addresses to our troops. Edward N. Scheiberling, National Commander of the American Legion, is one.

While the passage of conscription hangs in the balance in this country, news from England indicates that the Labor Party may oppose conscription there. Heretofore only the Independent Labor Party had taken a stand against conscription. On July 8, *Sunday Pictorial,* a labor newspaper, carried an article by Major General J. F. C. Fuller, military commentator, opposing peacetime military training.

Congress Considers

Representative Martin's bill for the international abolition of conscription states that "compulsory military service has never prevented war, in Europe or elsewhere, but on the contrary causes suspicion and fears to grow between nations, and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace." It concludes by asking the President, the Secretary of State, and the American representative on the United Nations Organization to "work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations." Observers in Washington indicate that congressmen will watch the volume of mail on this proposal for an indication of the public's attitude.

Chairman Woodrum, of the House Committee on Post-War Military Policy, makes a distinction between "military service" and "military training," and insists that Martin's bill would not apply to the system his committee proposes. It is generally conceded, however, that any agreement that is to be effective must abolish both training and actual service.

The Woodrum Committee, in recommending peacetime military training, apparently ignored the overwhelming opposition expressed by national organizations in the hearings. Only three members of the committee advocated postponement of the legislation until after the end of the war against Japan. They were: L. C. Arends of Illinois, A. L. Bulwinkle of North Carolina, and M. J. Bradley of Pennsylvania.

Chaplains Praise Conscription

Two high-ranking religious leaders, speaking at the hearings, extravagantly praised the plans for compulsory peacetime training. Brigadier-General Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains of the War Department, said: "It is no exaggeration to say that our boys in the Army and Navy come into more vital contact with the ministry of religion than they ever did or could at home. . . . If our parents, our educators, and our churchmen will do their part, something which they now accept as military necessity may become under their guidance a great democratic and spiritual experience."

Dr. Daniel Poling, Editor of *The Christian Herald,* President of the International Society of Christian Endeavor, and a high-ranking officer in the Chaplains Corps, declared: "No plan now proposed within religious groups offers so large a hope for the strengthening of America in her moral and spiritual life. . . . If the Chaplains' Corps receives in the peace the recognition, opportunity, and support given it in wartime by the government and by commanding officers, and if the churches of our faiths give to the chaplains their loyalty and support, then, gentlemen of the Committee, we shall have in universal military training America's greatest moral and religious opportunity since Independence Day, 1776."

Answer to Patton

General Patton spoke to the Sunday school children of the Episcopal Church of Our Saviour in San Gabriel, Calif., on June 10. He is reported to have said:

"You children here, whether you like it or not, are the soldiers and nurses of the next war. There will be war again, in my opinion, because there have always been such things."

Shortly thereafter the Army newspaper *Stars and Stripes,* published a letter from which we quote the following:

"Dear General Patton:

"I am one of 30,000 men who died under your command on our march across Europe. Last week you told a Sunday School class: 'You children are the soldiers and nurses of the next war.'

"Another war—not a hundred years from now, but right around the corner! I don't know what the other 29,999 boys did but I turned over in my grave, General, and the dirt above me moved because it isn't packed hard yet.

" . . . Yes, we died when you told us to die. We tried to do everything you asked of us because we thought of you as a great soldier. We still do. But may we now with all due respect ask one little favor in return?

"Just stay a soldier. Leave the peace up to those who are working their hearts out to make it stick. Leave them alone—for a little while anyway. And for God's sake stay out of my little brother's Sunday School class. He still thinks I died to make a better world for him.

"Signed, Private X."

Contest Winners

The Forerunners' essay contest on Peacetime Conscription, which ended May 31, was won by Miss Janet Murch, 15, student at Everett Senior High School at Everett, Mass. She will be given her choice of a trip to New York or Washington.

Other winners are Glen Camp, Pine Mountain, Ky.; Paul A. Rinden, New Haven, Conn.; Stanley D. Truelson, Jr., Amesbury, Mass.; Anna Louise Hale, Dwight, Ill.; Ralph E. Cook, Portland, Me. (each of whom will receive a cash prize of $10); and Louise McVey, Los Angeles, Calif.; John Yoder, Wooster, Ohio; Walter Hillis, New York City; Betty Van der Smissen, Buhler, Kans.; Ethel Adler, Rochester, N. Y.; Karl E. Meyer, New York City; and Walter Bell, Seattle, Washington (each of whom will receive $5 in books).

Black Dissents

The United States Supreme Court June 11 upheld the Illinois Supreme Court in refusing to admit a conscientious objector to the practice of law in that state.

Justice Reed delivered the 5-4 decision. Justice Black wrote a dissent in which Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge joined him.

The petitioner was Clyde Wilson Summers, who maintained that his position as conscientious objector was the sole basis on which he had been declared ineligible for admission to the bar.

Justice Black stated in his dissenting opinion: "The conclusion seems to me inescapable that if Illinois can bar this petitioner from the practice of law it can bar every person from every public occupation solely because he believes in non-resistance rather than in force."

A Pagan Peace

The Christian Century reported some time ago an address of Bernard Iddings Bell, Episcopal clergyman and author. Speaking at Dartmouth College Mr. Bell said: "We are in for a peace of expediency in which three great empires, having defeated three rival em-

pires, seek by power to impose their will upon all the rest of the world and in doing so fully to maintain their own control of world economic advantage. . . . That may be the best peace we can get, since all the nations are pagan; but at least we ought to be honest enough to admit that such a peace is contrary to the will of God as revealed in Christ."

Plea for Japanese

Agencies interested in just treatment for our people of Japanese ancestry have recommended that the district offices of the War Relocation Authority be kept open for at least a year after the closing of the centers (Jan. 1, 1946). Otherwise, many problems of readjustment will be unsolved. Interested persons should write to The Hon. Harold L. Ickes and to their Senators and Representatives.

In certain localities prejudiced persons are trying to organize economic pressure to prevent the return of Japanese-Americans to their homes. For example, the Oregon Property Owners' Protective League has been recently organized. Its president is a farmer who has leased the land of a Japanese-American and is now in court contesting the owner's right to repossess the land. He is holding mass meetings throughout the state for the purpose of rousing anti-nisei sentiment. FOR groups in several localities are already working to counteract such tactics.

Corbett Bishop Released

Corbett Bishop, CO who for many months has absolutely refused any cooperation with authorities seeking to enforce conscription and who for several months, while in the Federal prison of Milan, Mich., refused food, is now at the Macedonia Co-operative Community at Clarksville, Ga. As we go to press we are not aware of the details of the arrangement of his release. We do know that Bishop made no commitments with respect to parole regulations and that he expects to act as a free man with no responsibility to observe any laws or regulations seeking to impose conscription on him. We wish the Federal authorities could see that no good is accomplished and much evil done by keeping *anyone* in prison in this country for conscience' sake. Corbett Bishop has displayed magnificent steadfastness and courage in following the leading of his conscience.

C O's Denied Funds

The annual general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. recently rejected the proposal that $15,000 from its wartime fund for servicemen be used to help defray the expenses of CO's. This amount would have represented about 1.4 per cent of the church's total fund for men in the armed services.

Jottings

Not all the CO's are in the United States. Apparently Germany had her share, and some of them were women.

The *Bulletin* of the Central Board for CO's in London quoted an Associated Press dispatch of April 28 to the effect that advancing troops had found a military camp for German CO's. Only 41 persons survived in this particular camp, but it had contained hundreds and another camp had about 1200 religious pacifists, according to Dr. Emil Maurer, formerly district chairman of the Socialist Party in Vienna.

* * *

The overwhelming superiority of the United States in resources and industrial strength is the chief theme of leaflets now being dropped from airplanes on Japanese armies. The leaflets urge the soldiers to throw away their weapons, and assure them that "any number" of them "may surrender with this one leaflet."

* * *

The Pacific Northwest and Southwest FOR regions have decided to exchange dates for their fall conferences. The Northwest conference will be held in Seattle November 2-4, and the Southwest conference will be held in Los Angeles October 19-21.

* * *

The Southern FOR Conference is scheduled for October 5-7 in Nashville, Tenn., with the following speakers: Henry Hitt Crane, Bishop Paul B. Kern, Ira DeA. Reid, Broadus Mitchell, A. J. Muste.

* * *

The California Senate recently upheld Governor Earl Warren's veto of a bill which would have required candidates for public office or employment to state whether they would object to bearing arms in defense of their country.

* * *

Three good job openings have recently been called to our attention. They are: to teach school at a progressive rural school in Alabama; to manage a co-operative store in Yellow Springs, Ohio; and to direct youth activities in an interracial locality in Chicago. For further information, readers may write to FELLOWSHIP.

* * *

A memorial fund has been set up for James F. McDaniel, former Ohio FOR Secretary, who met with a fatal accident while working as a CO parolee at the University of Michigan Hospital in May. Contributions may be sent to Charles Butcher, 711 Haven Avenue, Ann Arbor, Mich.

* * *

Public disapproval of conscientious objectors has dropped from 74 per cent to 65 per cent during the past several weeks, according to a poll conducted by Public Opinion Research.

Intelligence tests used by the Army were recently given to 275 CPS men. Nearly 75 per cent of the CPS men fell in the same category as the Army group that had the highest scores, and the man scoring the lowest in CPS scored in the average group for Army men. The tests were carried out by the Brethren Service Committee.

* * *

Osmyn Stout is now serving as chairman of the Southwest Regional Committee of the FOR. This office had been vacant since Allan Hunter resigned last fall. Mr. Stout is a member of the Friends Church in Whittier and active in the youth group there. He has had social work training at the University of Southern California and is now doing probation work.

* * *

"We do ourselves no credit in overrating or belittling an earnest Christian leader who may yet be the hope of Japan," said L. S. Albright of the International Missionary Council in a recent analysis of criticisms which have been voiced against Kagawa.

Basing his conclusions largely on reports compiled by the United States Office of War Information, Mr. Albright pointed out that though Kagawa has openly criticized Great Britain and the United States for their war policy, he has also spoken against the Japanese war in China. In regard to sight-seeing tours which, it had been claimed, the Japanese Christian leader had made into territories seized by the Japanese, Mr. Albright indicated that although Kagawa had made at least one such trip (to China) and although Kagawa had made this trip as "guest" of Japanese military authorities, he had used the trip as an opportunity for evangelistic messages.

* * *

A farmer in Essex, England, was short of hired help, and some soldiers from the United States helped him with the crops. Later someone asked him how he liked the work of the Americans.

"Very much," replied the British farmer. "They were industrious and dependable, and I liked the way they sang; but I didn't care much for those white people that came along with them."

* * *

The University of Puebla (Mexico) student body went on strike recently protesting, among other matters, the presence of 42 summer school students from Texas.

The Mexican students, numbering 2,000, said they object to the Texans because the state of Texas allegedly discriminates against Mexicans.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Labor and Religion

Social Action, June 15, 1945. Published by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches. 15¢ each; in lots of fifty or more, 8¢ each.

This issue contains a series of articles of unusual importance for all members of the Fellowship and others who are concerned about the labor movement and problems in the field of industrial relations. An article by George Lindbeck describes in an objective fashion the Church and Industry Conferences which are being conducted in various cities throughout the country under the auspices of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. Lindbeck quotes from one of the pieces of material used by the NAM in such conferences: "Workers' primary responsibility is to be productive. Management has many responsibilities." He says that many of the features of these conferences which were criticized in the beginning have been changed "so that now even most of those who are deeply antagonistic to what they believe the NAM stands for would seem to be willing to concur with the sentiments of Presbyterian Pastor John Paul Jones." Dr. Jones said: "I don't object to the NAM's attempting to get its point of view over, but I hope it doesn't succeed."

Ernest Lefever, formerly staff member of the FOR, writes the next article, on "The PAC Sponsors Religious Associates." It, too, is a highly informative, comprehensive, and objective statement of the work being done by the religious associates of PAC, which is headed and sparked by Dwight J. Bradley, who not so long ago was the executive secretary of the Congregational Council for Social Action.

Important as these two articles are, they are surpassed in significance and value by the closing article on "The Minister Seeks Guiding Principles," written by Professor Liston Pope, of the Yale Divinity School, who is also the editor of *Social Action.* The article discusses strategy and tactics to be used by ministers and church people generally in dealing with controversial issues in the field of social action and in their contacts with pressure groups of various kinds. In my opinion it is by far the best statement of the kind that has ever been made. It would be difficult to improve upon, except for the fact that there is no discussion of the special role that non-violent Gandhian methods might play in this field. Says Dr. Pope: "Doubtless the Church does comprise a distinctive fellowship, but this fellowship is not likely to supplant or to transform secular society without taking into account those forces by which secular society is maintained and changed. . . . The effort to change individuals without consideration of their social context will not result in profound change either in the individual or in his context." He urges on ministers a positive type of activity; "the function of leadership is to lead, not to pacify."

The main portion of the article sets forth "a rough check list for consultation when one deliberates over whether to lend support to any program or organization." It seems to me that here in particular Dr. Pope has explored a new field and given ministers and other church workers a remarkably clear and complete set of tests by which to measure the numerous organizations which bid for their attention. He comments on the fact that some well-known American churchmen are such notorious joiners that "their names indicate practically nothing on the letterhead except their own affability and innocence."

A.J.M.

War and Society

The Power House. By Alex Comfort. Viking Press. 464 pages. $3.00.

This novel of the defeat of France is bitterly anti-war in theme and statement, and has been taken by some critics as the forerunner of a new school of post-war disillusionment. As fiction, I think it fails, although it is an ambitious piece of work, heavily documented, crammed with violent action and ideological discussion, and loaded with symbolic meaning. It is like a highly worked-up scrapbook, with materials drawn from many and diverse sources, which seem never to have come to life in the author's imagination. But since Alex Comfort is a poet of distinction, and a leading representative of a considerable group of young English writers, the viewpoint which he states, boldly and explicitly at times, is worth attention.

The book has been called a pacifist novel, but not on religious, social, humanitarian, or political grounds. The author apparently sees religion and politics of any sort as part of the mechanism of an insane society speeding to destruction. War, he seems to suggest, is only the greatest madness of this organized society; and the only answer to war is to escape, if you can, from all social obligations. Yet none of the people even in this book are really able to maintain complete personal aloofness. One of the characters, apparently most sympathetic to the author, is shown as escaping from the French Army by feigning appendicitis, but is later moved to write some "secret pamphlets on individual sanity," and so gets caught again in the fatal wheels of government.

Anarchism I suppose loosely describes this position, but I would call it rather an intense, isolated (and impossible) individualism. Mr. Comfort has the courage to state his bitter conviction unequivocally. But if this novel really does speak for a new generation, as the publishers claim, it seems to express a fatalism far beyond the famous "cynicism" that followed the last war. Also it seems to me to lead into an aesthetic as well as a social desert: for the logical end of this road is non-communication.

RUTH SUCKOW

Jewish Prophets

The Jew In Our Day, by Waldo Frank, introd. by Reinhold Niebuhr. Duell, Sloan, and Pierce. 199 pages. $2.50.

This seems to me a remarkably clear, convincing, and noble statement of the essence of Jewish-Christian prophetic religion to which I owe allegiance. "Other peoples have had prophets deep and great as the prophets of the Jews. The Jewish genius has been the approximate incorporation of the wisdom of their seers into everyday existence. . . . They knew first of all the nature of man and this knowing meant to love and to strive. . . . That was to know God. . . . The man who knows himself (the sole conduit to knowing God) is aware of his responsible fraternal relationship with everyday human life. . . . The fruit is democracy and justice. The sole seed from which these spring is love: the love that men know only insofar as they have known God and as the petty loves of their individual, class, and communal egoisms are, by the great love, overpowered."

I suppose Waldo Frank does not consider himself as unqualifiedly a pacifist. Yet he comes very close to holding that view of the ultimate nature of life and the universe which "taketh away the occasion of all war." He writes, "So long as we continue to see only the enemy outside, we shall learn nothing. More millions of men may bleed to death, more hundreds of ancient cities may blow to rubble: we shall still learn nothing. Only when we succeed in *interiorizing* our attention shall we stand upon the threshold of creative knowledge and may this world disaster become a dawn."

And I am moved almost to tears with gratitude to think that it was a Jew, Waldo Frank, who in this current book gave beautiful utterance to the Fellowship and Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light: "Hitler dares not reveal, even to himself, why he hates the Jews. He, too, is a man; somewhere deep within him he, too, knows the universal law of brotherhood. To deceive the people for his own twisted ends, he must begin by deceiving himself."

A.J.M.

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

CPS a Compromise

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Although I can respect the sincerity of Irl L. Balderstone for his conviction that CPS is a gain, I feel that some of the ideas he expressed in his letter in the April *Fellowship* involve a dangerous retreat from basic pacifist principles.

First, I am disturbed by his statement that Congress "could have forced him (the CO) into the Army and refused him any exemptions and rights." Even disregarding the fact that the Army learned a lesson from World War I and did not want COs in this war, it seems that saying that COs could be forced into the Army is an admission of weakness on our part. Certainly our aim should not be one of seeking comfort for ourselves, and our job is not to escape acting from basic principles merely because a higher cost is involved in such action. It seems to me that in this era of action the analogy between the pacifist and the soldier becomes meaningful. Is it not more honest to say that we pacifists should be willing to sacrifice all for sticking to our principles—just as the soldier does—rather than utilize the soldier's suffering as an excuse for accepting whatever inadequate alternative is offered to us?

Very few people would attempt to defend an "absolute" position, but accepting a doctrine of relativity does not exempt one from drawing the line somewhere. Irl Balderstone says that "one must compromise in nearly everything one does in order to live in society." The implication that because compromise is involved in all life we must continue to compromise all along the line seems to me to be fundamentally unsound. The ideal is to compromise as little as possible rather than to justify compromise of basic principles on the vague assumption that life is founded on compromise.

Finally, I believe it is fallacious to label CPS a "stepping stone that may be used to build a better world." If we accept the type of conscription as an adequate pacifist alternative we never will be able to make any greater gains in the struggle for freedom of conscience in our country. The fact that a very small group of men have thrown their total weight against the conscription system has already had profound results in the thinking of certain American political figures. Certainly Attorney General Biddle's very liberal recommendations to Congress which include such measures as foreign relief work and absolute exemption were not the result of widespread co-operation with the CPS system. Who can say what would be the outcome if *all* pacifists were to make a clear-cut break with the conscription system, basing their action on principle rather than on a philosophy of compromise? Surely such action would provide a more solid stepping stone to future progress than continued acquiescence in a recognized evil.

LARRY GARA.

Taxes for War

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The letter in your July number on "Taxes and War" by Julien Cornell attracted my attention because I am one who has had the same "pangs of conscience" about paying for the war that the young men who are conscientious objectors have about entering the forces.

For the past two years I have paid only that percentage of my income tax which goes toward non-war purposes. According to the United States Treasury Dept. $89,-720,000,000 was spent on war out of a total of $95,273,000,000 in 1944, and the estimate for 1945 is 89 billion out of 99 billion.

For a number of years I had used very much the same arguments as Julien Cornell in quieting my conscience. I was aware of the fact that I could not be consistent in avoiding to pay the cost of war, for:

(1) All expenses are paid out of one general U.S. Treasury Fund.

(2) All expenses are somewhat affected by the war.

(3) Income taxes are said to be levied to avoid inflation, not to pay for war.

(4) Eventually the government can take far more in penalties than what we pay in taxes.

(5) The tax of one individual is but a small drop in the bucket anyway.

To answer these objections in order I submit the following:

(1) and (2) The fact that certain taxes are unavoidable is no reason why we should pay that particular tax which Julien Cornell points out is "self-assessed" and "voluntarily paid."

3. It is merely an equivocation to say that the avoidance of inflation is not part and parcel of the war effort.

4. The fact that the government will take more from us eventually through penalties does not mean that more lives will be lost on that account. What we do will not affect the conduct of the war, but our resistance is a concrete testimony of our religious stand.

5. The fact that our tax is but a minute part of the total is of no more significance than that a CO is but one in millions.

To make our individual position more vivid, let us imagine for a moment that we are in the hands of brigands and that our precious little children have been taken from us to be burned alive on a pile in the public square. We have been completely powerless to save them. And now the brigands ask us for a match with which to light that fire!

We know that our refusal cannot save our children from torture, that other matches will be forthcoming, that a tiny match is but a minute part of the whole horrible procedure, that we will suffer severely if we refuse, but would we *voluntarily* go and produce a match in answer to that demand? I think not.

I hear someone say: "But those are your own children."

To which we answer fervently: "So are we all one human family, all God's children."

VALERIE H. RIGGS.

Is India to Be Free?

(Continued from page 143)

they are offered at a time of British strength, at a time of victory rather than of defeat, and partly because the Viceroy's accompanying broadcast in India was couched in friendly and appealing terms. There is a wide-spread belief which may or may not be true, that Lord Wavell had a hard struggle with Mr. Churchill in London before the latter consented to this plan, and that now he (Lord Wavell) means business by it.

If he is able to convince the party leaders that he intends, as far as possible, to turn his Executive into a Cabinet, where he will let his Indian colleagues shape and direct policy, great results may follow. He has also to convince the Congress leaders that no attempt is being made to undermine the unity of India; and Mr. Jinnah must be convinced that the Muslim demand for separate status is not being jeopardized. The Princes, for the time being, remain outside the picture.

It will be a great thing for India if her political freedom can be launched while Mr. Gandhi lives; for he, above all, will act as the keeper of India's conscience, to guarantee that her political life starts under the banner of moral law, single-minded in the determination to make the welfare of the "dumb, semi-starved millions" the prime concern of her statesmanship. Let us pray that the police state of today may become the welfare state of tomorrow.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rust Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Louise Rounds, 3302 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Stewart, 440 E. 13th Ave., Denver 3, Colo.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

Are the German people responsible for the Nazi war crimes? Read —

The Responsibility of Peoples

Dwight Macdonald's able answer to a most serious question. 16 pages. **15¢**

Can the United States solve her problems and maintain world peace by adopting

Conscription After the War?

Harrop and Ruth Freeman discuss all the arguments in the newest of the Forerunner Studybooks. 64 pages. **25¢**

Will economics succeed, where politics has failed, in making war unnecessary?

The Economics of Peace

Kenneth Boulding's clear analysis of economic foundations of peace. **$2.75**

Materialistic totalitarianism cannot meet human need. What lies ahead?

The Yogi and the Commissar

Koestler's essays on Russia, war, literature, etc. Cloth, 247 pages. **$2.75**

The world's only hope of enduring peace lies in putting religion to work.

The Will of God for These Days

Kirby Page's clear interpretation of Christianity's meaning today. **$1.00**

"Peace imposed by violence is not peace but a suppressed conflict."

The Power of Non-violence

Richard Gregg's classic in a new, revised edition; 3 new chapters. **$1.50**

IMPORTANT PAMPHLETS

Clash by Night ..... **25¢**
Pendle Hill pamphlet on CPS written by Wallace Hamilton in response to an award by Pendle Hill Publications.

Reflections of a Pastor in Occupied France 25¢
Meditations written by Henri Roser, former French FOR Secretary; with biographical sketch by Nevin Sayre.

A Mechanistic or a Human Society? ..... **25¢**
Wilfred Wellock's plea for a human society in this machine age. With a foreword by Ralph Templin.

Congress Looks at the C.O. ..... **50¢**
Complete text of Congressional discussions about CO's from 1940 through 1943, compiled by the NSBRO.

What Should a Christian Do? ..... **5¢**
The Christian pacifist position explained by E. Stanley Jones, before the war, with a recent note added.

Introduction to Consumers Co-operation .. **15¢**

Pacifica Studies in Conscientious Objection 75¢
Eight articles by Dewey, Tagore, and others written from 1917-20; with biographical sketches of authors.

Small Community Economics ..... **25¢**
Arthur E. Morgan's outline of possibilities for the improvement of life in the towns of rural areas.

The Churches and War ..... **25¢**
Roland H. Bainton's survey of the historic attitudes toward Christian participation in war.

ON CONSCRIPTION

Legislation for peacetime conscription for universal military training may be passed by Congress this fall unless our people express their opposition forcibly during the next few months. Be informed! Inform others!

SPECIAL OFFER—Packet of 25 different booklets, leaflets, flyers, reprints and other materials on conscription. **$1.00**

SEND FOR COMPLETE LIST

FELLOWSHIP REPRINTS

America's War Casualties
By Charles Iglehart in July issue of FELLOWSHIP. 25¢ a dozen, $1.50 a hundred, $10 a thousand.

Our War Aims in the Pacific
Statement by 70 ministers and educators in July issue. 15¢ a dozen, $1.00 for 150, $7.50 for 1,000.

We Say No to Jim Crow
By George M. Houser in April issue of FELLOWSHIP. 5¢ each, 50¢ a dozen, $2.50 a hundred.

The Third Evacuation
By Caleb Foote in the June issue of FELLOWSHIP. 5¢ each, 50¢ a dozen, $2.50 a hundred.

Selections from "The Power of Non-violence"
Richard B. Gregg's articles in December and January. 35¢ a dozen, $1.25 for 50, $2.00 for 100.

CASH WITH ORDER EXPEDITES SERVICE AND REDUCES EXPENSE—THANK YOU!

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION • 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.